

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has required election in the present application between:

Group I, claims 1-2, drawn to pixel resolution conversion for display device, classified in class 345, subclass 3.3;

Group II, claims 3-4, drawn to conversion aspect ratios of display image, classified in class 348, subclass 445; and

Group III, claims 5-6, drawn to display driving synchronization control circuit for a display device, classified in class 345, subclass 213.

The Examiner has also required an election in the present application between:

Species I, illustrated in Fig(s). 12-18;

Species II, illustrated in Fig(s). 19-21;

Species III, illustrated in Fig(s). 22-24;

Species IV, illustrated in Fig(s). 25-27;

Species V, illustrated in Fig(s). 28-29;

Species VI, illustrated in Fig(s). 30-31; and

Species VII, illustrated in Fig(s). 32.

For the purpose of examination of the present application, Applicants elect Group I, Species I, illustrated in Figs. 12-18, with traverse. Claims 1-2 are directed to the elected species and Group.

For a proper Election/Restriction Requirement, the Examiner must demonstrate that 1) the claims are either independent or distinct, and 2) a serious burden will be on the Examiner to examine all claims. In the absence of any statements addressing 1) and 2), the Election/Restriction Requirement is improper and therefore must be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the Election/Restriction Requirement.

In the present case it may be true that some technical features are not shared by all the species of the invention, however, all species share a number of features that represent the same inventive concept, including at least one clock generator, input, synchronizing signal generator, and an output.

The several species represent embodiments of increasing complexity, where the interrelationship of the various parts are of such a nature that they cannot easily be represented as alternatives within a single independent claim or as several dependent claims referring back to one common dependent claim. However, the examiner has failed to show that the number of common features and the overall design and functionality of the several embodiments are insufficient for linking them together as alternative embodiments of one inventive concept.

Based on the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met his burden and has not established the absence of a technical relationship among the inventions that involves at least one common or corresponding special technical feature. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the election requirement be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Examiner has already examined claims 1-6 twice. Accordingly, the Examiner has already established that *no serious burden* will be on the Examiner to further examine the claims.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the election requirement be withdrawn.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam, Registration No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant